DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 077 130 EA 005 090

AUTHOR Remstad, Robert C.
TITLE An Historical Overview and Critique of the Extended School Year Movement.
INSTITUTION Southeast Wisconsin Regional Education Center, Burlington.
REPORT NO SWREC-5-72-024
PUB DATE May 72
NOTE 34p.

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS *Analytical Criticism; Bibliographies; Cost Effectiveness; Educational Finance; Educational History; Educational Quality; *Extended School Year; Facility Utilization Research; Feasibility Studies; Individualized Instruction; *Literature Reviews; Maturation; *School Calendars; School Schedules; Social Attitudes; Summer Schools; *Year Round Schools

ABSTRACT

This paper provides educational and lay groups in the local community with background information and a good comprehensive review of the literature. The aim is to facilitate investigations into the complex issues involved in the consideration of extended school year scheduling. The review begins with a sketch of a simple model of the school calendar that emphasizes variables manipulated in creating options to the traditional 9-month calendar. A listing of the major issues that a local feasibility study should address and a discussion of the extent to which the existing literature illuminates those issues follows. Finally, a brief historical overview of this nation's experience with ESY is presented. A related document is EA 005 089. (Author/MLF)

ED 077130

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

AN HISTORICAL OVERVIEW AND CRITIQUE OF THE EXTENDED SCHOOL YEAR MOVEMENT

A Publication of the
Southeast Wisconsin Regional Education Center
Serving CESA 16 and CESA 18
(ESY Information Service)
May, 1972
Burlington, Wisconsin

Prepared by
Robert C. Remstad
Project Associate

5-72-024

EA 005 090

FILMED FROM BEST AVAILABLE COPY

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction	1
Modification of the School Calendar	3
Staggered Instruction - Vacation Approach	3
Lengthened Instructional Year Approach	5
Individualized Schedule Approach	7
Major Issues Related to ESY	8
Historical Overview	13
Bluffton, Indiana	15
Newark, New Jersey	15
Nashville, Tennessee	17
Aliquippa and Ambridge Pennsylvania	19
Atlanta, Georgia	26
Valley View, Illinois	27
Conclusion	29
References	30

INTRODUCTION

Traditional school calendars result in obvious underutilization of expensive educational facilities for substantial portions of each calendar year. Forces generated by a variety of demographic, economic and social factors have led to an unprecedented[1] interest in increased utilization of school buildings and equipment as a means of reducing educational costs or of increasing education quality. One product of this interest is a veritable library of articles, books and reports on topics such as the Year-Round School, the Rescheduled School Calendar or the Extended School Year[2]. A second outcome is a growing number of local school committees charged with studying, evaluating and making recommendations about adoption of an ESY plan. Finally, a small but growing number of local school districts across the nation are experimenting with optional forms of ESY.

The primary purpose of this paper is to provide background information to educational and lay groups in the local community to facilitate their efforts to investigate the complex issues involved in the consideration of Extended School Year Scheduling. The Southeast Wisconsin Regional Education Center (SWREC) is in the process of accumulating a comprehensive reference library on the topic of the extended school year. To date our bibliography contains over 600 entries dating back to the beginning of the century. The job of sorting through this extensive mass of material and identifying those documents which are significant and useful is a tedious task that need not be repeated by each local study committee. Moreover, because of the recent renewed interest in ESY and the newness of certain approaches to operationalizing an ESY, no good comprehensive review of the literature exists. It is hoped that this paper will remedy this condition.

A cursory examination of what has been written on ESY emphasizes the shallowness of much of the literature. Counted in pages, or weighed in pounds, the bulk of writing is devoted to descriptions of ways in which schools could implement an ESY and rationales for why this would lead to economies or increased learning. Much of this material is second-hand reporting of material from a handful of articles[3]. In general, data as to how schools did implement ESY and how ESY resulted in economies

---

[1] Of over 600 references to extended school year that we have identified, half have been published since 1966.

[2] While subtle difference exist among these terms, Extended School Year (ESY) will be used as the generic term for all attempts to increase facility utilization through longer school days or longer school years.

[3] The National Education Association in 1968 published a Research Summary, The Rescheduled School Year (ref.), describing ESY experiments going back to the turn of the century based upon a set of references dating back to only 1953.

or increased learning are conspicuously absent. Where data does exist the validity of that data is often compromised by inaccuracies, inconsistencies or the absence of related data that one might expect to find included. What data does exist has to do with the economic side of the question rather than the equally important issue of what happens to learning.

Another characteristic of the literature is the degree to which relatively simple ideas have been complicated, camouflaged and confused by extreme verbiage and complex models or diagrams[1]. Glinke (1971), for example, details forty-three separate variations to ESY. Thomas (1965a, 1965b, 1966, 1968 and New York State Education Department, 1965, 1969, 1970) in a series of New York State Education Department publications, devotes hundreds of pages of text and diagram to explaining a series of variations which he has titled trimester, quadrimester, continuous progress, extended K-12, nonaccelerated trimester, twelve-four term rotation, continuous learning year and multiple trails to name only the major variations. Thomas (1969) complains that school administrators are often turned off by the complexity of ESY plans, a situation which he has helped create.

A final characteristic of the ESY literature which should be emphasized is the generally uncritical acceptance of the assumptions of other writers, assumptions which definitely should be questioned. Bauman (1966) in a much quoted paper, projects that national acceptance of year-round schools would have led to instructional savings of nearly three-quarters of a billion dollars during fiscal year 1960. In none of the articles quoting Bauman does questioning of the basic assumption that lead to these dramatic savings occur. Careful reading of Bauman's paper reveals that these projected instructional savings are the result of suggesting that teachers operate the schools for 133 1/3 per cent as many days per year for 120 per cent as much salary. This is justified by pointing out that most teachers either have a second job or work during the summer months at a more menial job and would welcome year-round employment as teachers. While the desire for year-round employment undoubtedly exists for many teachers, it is doubtful that teachers would support a one-third extension of days taught for a one-fifth increase in salary. Yet Bauman's suggestion of potential instructional savings of approximately 10% has been uncritically passed along in much of the literature without reference to the assumption which allowed him to project this figure.

This review of the ESY concept and related literature will begin with an attempt to sketch out a simple model of the school calendar which emphasizes the variables that have been manipulated in creating options to the traditional nine month calendar. A listing of the major issues which a local feasibility study should address and a discussion of the extent to which the existing literature illuminated those issues following. Finally a brief historical overview of this nation's experience with ESY will be presented.

---

[1] The demonstration calendar drawn up to present the Valley View 45-15 Plan to the community was a 34 foot long, four color display (Hermanson and Gove, 1971, 67p).

MODIFICATION OF THE SCHOOL CALENDAR

The school calendar is basically a series of alternating periods of instruction and vacation. Decision about changes in that calendar must be decisions about 1) the starting date of the initial period of instruction, 2) the ratio of instruction to vacation time, 3) the length and frequency of the instruction - vacation cycle, 4) the definition of the basic unit (typically a five to six hour day) of the cycle, and 5) the necessity for all students to be on the same schedule. Traditionally, a school year has consisted of a single instruction-vacation cycle, in an instruction-vacation ratio of three to one and measured in days. This cycle begins about September 1 and, in general, all students are on a single schedule.

A typical calendar year of 365 days has 104 or 105 Saturdays and Sundays. In addition, there are six legal holidays[1], a two day teachers' convention break, the Friday after Thanksgiving, and Christmas Eve, on which school is traditionally not operated in Wisconsin. Vacation during the week between Christmas and New Year's Day and a week long spring vacation about Easter reduces the number of days on which to operate schools to 240 or 241, depending upon the number of Saturdays and Sundays in a particular year. Most discussions of ESY recognize 240 days as the maximum number of days per year a school could be operated. Utilization of facilities on Saturdays would add approximately 50 days to this number, but none of the prevalent ESY plans involves Saturday school attendance.

A school year is typically 180 days[2] with a starting date about September 1. Depending upon the exact number of days taught and the expansion of the holidays and vacation periods listed above, the school year usually terminates during the last week of May or the first two weeks of June. Attempts to modify this basic calendar to obtain better utilization of physical facilities or to improve the service provided by the schools have typically been variations of one of three general approaches to ESY.

The Staggered[3] Instruction - Vacation Approach

One basic scheme for an ESY is to fix upon 180 days of instruction out of the possible 240 days available as the desirable goal, recognize that not all students need be in school at one time, divide the 240 days into equal modules and arrange for staggered attendance

---

[1] New Year, Memorial, Independence, Labor, Thanksgiving and Christmas Days.

[2] A survey of regulations in 40 states concerning length of school year (Compact, Vol. 4, No. 6, December 1970) lists only Kentucky as requiring more than 180 days of school attendance and only four states with minimums less than 175 days.

[3] The literature uses both rotating and staggered to describe cyclical plans of this type. We have adopted staggered as the more accurate description of what is actually done in these plan.

with 75% of the students in school during any given module and the remaining 25% on vacation. Given this ratio of instruction to vacation, there are a number of theoretically possible schedules. Begin by thinking of the traditional schedule as a 180-60[1] schedule with one cycle per year. The module is 60 days. Dividing this module by any number that results in an even number leads to a new schedule with shorter cycles of instruction-vacation but more cycles per calendar year. These possibilities are completely enumerated in Table 1 along with appropriate references to those that are discussed in the literature. Admittedly some of these alternatives seem impractical either because of the shortness of the cycle or the module not being a multiple of 5. It should, however, be recognized that the sanctity of the five day work week and the two day weekend is being challenged by a growing number of business and government operations and that colleges and universities have long operated instructional programs on a Monday, Wednesday, Friday or Tuesday, Thursday schedule. Moreover, the Valley View, Illinois, 45-15 Plan calls for instructional modules to variously begin and end on all five days of the week, with over 1/6 of the total instruction taking place in blocks of 4 days or less.[2]

Table 1. Possible ratios of instruction-vacation which could serve as a model for a staggered attendance plan, based upon the assumption of a 180 day school year.

Ratio of Instruction to Vacation	Module (in school days)	No. of Cycles per year	Minimum Length of Vacation* (in actual days)	Name of Plan and Reference
180-60	60	1	86	Staggered quarter Vanderslice, 1930, 1933
90-30	30	2	44	
60-20	20	3	30	12-4, N.Y. State Education Dept., 1970
45-15	15	4	23	45-15, Hermanson and Gove, 1971
36-12	12	5	18	
30-10	10	6	16	
18-6	6	10	10	Probably not practical because of short length of vacation.
15-5	5	12	9	
12-4	4	15	6	
9-3	3	20	3	
6-2	2	30	2	
3-1	1	60	1	

* Based upon assumption that for all modules of 5 or more days, the instruction period would begin on Monday or terminate on a Friday.

[1] One of the confusing aspects of ESY literature is that these various staggered plans have some times been described in days, sometimes months and sometimes in quarters or fifths. We will be consistent and use days.

[2] From calendar on page 84 of Hermanson and Gove, 1971.

The real point of Table 1 is to emphasize the large number of alternatives that do exist. There are at least six alternatives providing a minimum vacation of two weeks at any given time that could be considered by districts interested in staggered instruction-vacation plans. The literature provides little indication that support for any given staggered plan resulted from a choice among options or even recognition that options exist, let alone, evidence or logical rationale supporting the recommended plan. We believe that adequate consideration of ESY operation requires explicit attention to the question of why one alternative should be preferred over the others. Experimentation in this country has been either with the 45-15 or the staggered quarter or 180-60 option. Several foreign countries operate on an annual schedule which includes two extended vacations, a modified 90-30 approach. Summer instruction has frequently been in four and six week blocks of instruction indicating that 20 or 30 day instructional blocks are feasible. Thus it would seem that any of the first six ratios proposed in Table 1 are viable options.[1]

The questions which require answers to make intelligent choices among these six options are questions which, to date, have not been satisfactorily answered. Are short but frequent vacations more conducive to achieving the purpose of schools than longer, less frequent ones? What is the optimal block of instructional time for most units taught in our schools? Are there societal or family problems which are accentuated or meliorated by one schedule rather than another? What schedule leads to maximal production by teachers? How costly, in time and money, is the reorganization of school that is required at the beginning of each module? Does frequent reorganization of a school have undesirable psychological effects upon students?

The Lengthened Instructional Year Approach

A second basic approach to extending the school year is to have students attend school for an increased number of days each year and, possibly, more hours per day, with the intent of accomplishing twelve years of schooling in eleven or fewer years. Some who favor this approach, play down the acceleration aspects and argue that there is more to know today than in years past and that each child needs more hours of instruction to become educated. Of course, in the absence of committment to acceleration and early graduation there is no possibility of economic savings from this plan. To facilitate experimentation in this type of ESY the state of Pennsylvania has passed legislation permitting definition of a school year in terms of 990 hours rather than 180 days of instruction. (Shafer, 1970).

Legal definitions of a minimum school day vary from 4 hours in Connecticut to 6 1/2 hours in Mississippi and Tennessee.[2] Much of the activity included in the school day is not instruction per se and could as well be cone on the students' own schedule and, perhaps, in

---

[1] It should be observed that any other instruction-vacation ratio, such as 200-40 produces a similar table.

[2] In a review of state action on ESY in the December, 1970, Compact.

his choice of location. College students, only one year older than high school seniors, presumably profit from schedules which vary considerably from day to day. This variability emphasizes how little we know about the appropriate length of a school day. The many schools that operate on a 200 day or 40 week schedule and the many successful experiences with summer sessions similarly provide evidence that 180 days per year is no upper bound to the number of days per year a student may profitably spend in school. Data exists to support the contention that today's youth may be reaching physical maturity at a much accelerated rate over that of their parents and grandparents. Tanner, (1968) suggests that today's eleven year old may be the physical equivalent of the twelve year old of thirty years ago. Cognitive development and the maturity to profit from school may be accelerating at a similar pace. The state of Wisconsin has recognized this by lowering the age of majority from twenty-one to eighteen. Thus, there is evidence that both the concept of more hours of education per day or more days per year and the idea of completion of the present high school curriculum one or more years earlier than at present are feasible with respect to the physical and psychological characteristics of students and the nature of the educational tasks to be accomplished.

Whether acceleration and early completion of high school is feasible in a political, sociological or economic sense is another question. Existing work laws designed to protect under-eighteen young people may discriminate against sixteen and seventeen year old high school graduates. The present job market and unemployment rates suggest that more young people seeking full time jobs will be a negative rather than positive influence. Many parents have deep reservations about the adequacy with which a sixteen year old can handle the personal and social freedoms of today's college campus. Balanced against these arguments is the yet to be demonstrated effects that thousands of new, young voters may have both upon the legal rights of pre-eighteen year olds and upon the educational politics in local communities.

Related to this lengthened school year approach has been the summer session program operated for purposes other than remedial. Such programs have increased rapidly over the past fifteen years and have undoubtedly provided much impetus to the idea that today's students can profit from a lengthening of the school year. On the other hand, the voluntary nature of such programs, the charging of tuition, the extent to which growth of such programs were fueled by the desire ro provide teachers with summer employment rather than student demand are differences which should temper the temptation to generalize that experience to the ESY concept.

Intelligent decision-making on this type of ESY option also requires answers to questions which to date have not met with adequate response. If more instruction is needed to face a more complex world, what procedures need be developed to guarantee that more instruction does indeed occur? Who decides what the new areas of instruction will be? This implies some knowledge about the purposes of existing curricula that probably does not exist. Other questions have to do with determining the appropriate number of hours that children of different age can profitably attend school and deciding how to integrate new instructional units into existing curricula.

If the school year is to be extended to accelerate progress through the existing curriculum, another set of questions must be answered. These relate to post high school educational

opportunities, the job market, and assuming adult responsibilities and rights at even younger ages than at present. Indeed, because of the problems that early graduation may generate one may resonably ask whether this approach is feasible on anything but a regional, or perhaps statewide, basis.

The Individualized Schedule Approach

The third approach that has been suggested defines school as a set of tasks to be mastered, objectives to be attained or experiences to be had and, through an individualized approach to instruction, permits the student to define his own schedule of hours and days of attendance. This schedule, of course, being subject to various restrictions including satisfying minimal levels of attendance and mastery of objectives. Atlanta officials[1] talk of schools which will be open from 7 a.m. to 10 p.m. with students engaged in flexible curricula involving extensive outside-of-school experiences, work experiences, joint enrollments with local colleges, etc. With Atlanta's elementary age children, there is a move toward ungradedness, openness and a criterion-mastery type curriculum. Thomas (N.Y. State Education Dept., 1968) has come up with a variation of this basic approach, the Multiple Trails schedule, which has been much quoted in the literature of the past 5 years. He suggests a beginning stage of multi-modular scheduling which by steps moves toward a completely ungraded, individualized arrangement.

It should be pointed out that this approach to extending school operation is totally dependent upon the education profession being able to develop and master techniques for individualizing instruction. The desirability of education experiences tailor-made to the individual student has long been acknowledged by educational theorists. That most education today is still group-oriented with little freedom for students to proceed toward their individual goals at their own pace is indicative of the practical problems of implementing an individualized approach - problems which must be solved before one can go this route. Unlike the other two approaches this calls for an almost complete revision of existing instructional practices, an effort that will require a large initial investment in both people and material resources.

All plans for lengthened operation of public schools are either variations or combinations of these three basic approaches - staggered instruction-vacation cycle, lengthened instructional year or individualized schedule plan. Plans for a specific community must take into account such varied factors as state regulations for school operation, the number of legal holidays, traditional community vacation procedures in business and industry as well as in the schools, and the master contract for teachers. The intent here has been to call attention to the wide variety of options available while at the same time providing a relatively compact framework within which one can easily categorize various ESY options.

---

[1] Jarvis Barnes, Asst. Superintendent for Research and Development, Atlanta Public Schools. In remarks to UWM sponsored Administrators Conference 1/7/72, Red Carpet Inn, Milwaukee, Wisconsin.

MAJOR ISSUES RELATED TO ESY

Before going into a history of the ESY movement in this country and examination of specific ESY alternatives it would be well to consider some major issues which should be faced by any school district considering adopting an ESY schedule. The vast bulk of writing which has been done on ESY has been by proponents of the concept. Much of it could be accurately described as propaganda for ESY and, as such, tends to overstate, to rely disproportionately on verbal argument rather than empirical data and to accentuate the positive and ignore the negative. In reading the pages that follow one may detect a negative bias. Let it be recognized that this bias, to the extent that it exists, is not negative to the concept of ESY but rather is negative or critical of the generally uncritical, anti-empirical quality of much of the literature which has been generated about the topics of year-round schools, restructured school calendars, more efficient use of school facilities or extended school year.

Any specific ESY plan should be viewed as a possible solution to an existing problem. In order to effectively compare and evaluate alternate ESY plans one must have defined that existing problem or problems. In general these problems are ones of school cost and educational quality. Everyone can agree that it would be desirable to reduce costs and increase quality. Unfortunately, the relationship between these two factors is such that undue reduction in costs is likely to have a negative effect on quality of education and substantial increases in quality are likely to cost more money. It is true that there is some slack in all school systems which would permit maintenance of present quality while reducing costs or increasing quality at present expenditure levels. However, it should be understood that taking the slack out of a system has a price, also, although perhaps not in dollars or, at least, not in school tax dollars. This price may be extracted in terms of increased physical and psychological stress placed on students and professional staff, sociological upset of a community's existing life style or individual inconvenience. It may show up in increased recreational or juvenile police expenditures. This is not to suggest that the price of removing the slack from a school system may not be worth the gains, but merely to emphasize that there is a price and that it should be identified and considered in any study of ESY.[1]

This basic equation of school cost on the one side equalling existing quality of education plus slack on the other is appealingly deceptive in its simplicity. Much of the rationale supporting ESY is at this level with unused physical facilities usually

---

[1] One could argue that the reason that the ESY experiments of the first four decades of this century had all ceased by 1940 was that the communities involved citizens, students and professional educators -- felt the price was too high even though tax dollars were being saved or higher quality education being achieved.

seen as a major component of slack. This is inadequate. Arguing for increased quality of education is meaningless rhetoric without specifying quality for whom, in what aspects of education and toward what criteria of quality. Increased quality of education for one person might be increased reading achievement, generally on the part of elementary school students. For another it might be reducing the drop-out rate among minority group students to that of white middle class youngsters. For yet a third person it might be reflected in a loosening of school regulations with more responsibility being given to the individual student. We suggest that these three definitions of increased quality require three quite different types of activity, each costing different amounts of money. Thus, it is meaningless to consider taking some specific action, such as implementing an ESY schedule, for the purpose of improving the quality of education without specifying the indicators of quality that one expects to affect.

At first glance, dealing with the cost side of the equation would seem to be simpler and, indeed, much of the literature supports that position. However, one does not make major scheduling changes in an agency such as the public schools without those changes pervading all aspects of community life. Recreation budgets, will obviously be affected.. Businesses which cater to vacationing youth or which utilize substantial amounts of student labor will need to adjust to the change and possibly incur increased costs or decreased receipts. Individual families may find their pocketbooks affected as frequent short vacations by students interfere with work arrangements for the mother or create extra baby-sitting charges. Reducing school costs only to have those costs reappear in the budgets of other governmental units, the profit and loss statements of local business or in the available purchasing power of individual citizens may not make sense. Yet, even such an obvious related item as recreation program costs is not mentioned in many analyses of the economic impact of an ESY program that we have reviewed.

Many of the costs analysis articles seem based upon belief in a type of ESY alchemy that permits proponents of ESY programs to uncritically accept claims of cost savings where no good reason for expecting those savings exist. The major argument for the cost effectiveness of ESY is that of utilizing expensive physical facilities and related equipment for twelve months of the year rather than for only nine or ten. The utilization of these expensive resources to a fuller extent is the essence of ESY and is the only area of the budget where it makes sense to expect savings from ESY unless, of course, one introduces reductions in the quantity or quality of educational services along with the ESY calendar. Further, savings are possible only with those physical resources which become obsolete or wear out from the passage of time rather than from heavy usage. For example, while roofs wear out from exposure to the elements over time and are thus a potential source of savings by ESY, carpeting and floor tile wear out from use and a one-third increase in use can be expected to result in a proportionate decrease in their useful life. Similarly, textbooks in current affairs which become obsolete before they receive excessive use are a potential source of ESY savings, but math texts which need replacing only when the set has become exceedingly worn would not.

Instructional costs are by far the largest item in any school budget, but one should seriously question any promises of ESY savings in this area. The 10% instructional savings figures projected by Bauman (1964), based on the assumption that one could increase the days taught by teachers without proportionate increases in salary, are still much quoted. In truth, the opposite is more likely true. While it is true that the school systems that went year-round in the 1930's did reduce the rate of teacher pay for extra months taught, this has not been the practice of the present ESY operations. Furthermore, spreading school attendance over 240 days rather than 180 decreases the concentrations of children of common age, ability or interest and probably will result initially in somewhat smaller, and thus costlier, student-teacher ratios. A feasibility study (White, J. B., 1966) of seven different ESY options in the Polk County, Florida schools suggested that instructional costs could be expected to increase as much as 23% depending upon the ESY alternative considered.

Another area where some writers have projected savings is the student transportation area. It should be realized that ESY options based upon more days of school per year or upon a rotating schedule to avoid new building construction can never result in a decreased number of student-miles per year. In fact, only if new construction would be on the site of existing facilities would the number of miles stay the same. One may be able to argue that bus operation during summer months is somewhat more economical than winter driving, that bus replacement is, in part, dictated by age rather than just miles traveled and that, therefore, driving fewer busses more miles per year is economical, or that there are savings to be recognized by hiring bus drivers year round. These claims must be balanced against the very real possibility that educating more children in a fixed number of buildings will require substantially more transportation of students. Certainly one should expect no substantial cost benefits in student transportation from an ESY plan.

Administrative costs are another area in which some writers have predicted savings from ESY operation. In part, this is based on claims that many administrative personnel are on 12-month contracts presently and, therefore, since no new buildings will be needed no expansion of administrative personnel will be needed. This may be true during the initial year of ESY implementation since the number of students is unlikely to increase more than a few percent from the preceeding year. However, as the full potential of ESY plans for handling up to one-third more students are realized, administrative and clerical increases of proportionate size will be needed. This is based upon the contention that school personnel now employed during periods in which school is not in session are engaged in performing useful and needed functions, functions which they do not have time to perform during those months that school is operating. Giving substantial added responsibilities to administrators who are presently working full time must eventually lead to either requests for overtime compensation, the hiring of more personnel or a generally lower level of performance on both new and existing functions. To deny this is to admit that much of what administrators currently do when schools are not in session is unnecessary busywork. If so, one doesn't need an ESY plan to save money.

Related to this administrative cost problem is one having to do with teacher's contracts which has received little or no attention in the literature. Teachers are typically employed for more days than school is in session. A system which has students in school 180 days per year may employ teachers for 185 or 190 days, the extra days being spent on planning, housekeeping and in-service activities essential to the operation of a good school. When one expands the teaching year to 240 days, as is often suggested, when and how do these functions get performed? As with the administrative tasks one must either project requests for additional compensation for Saturday and evening work, hire additional personnel, or expect a generally lower level of functioning. The alternative is to argue that the existing extra days of employment are a makework device to justify higher teacher salaries.

A number of school districts operated ESY programs for extended numbers of years during the period 1900-1940. Reports of those programs which appear in the literature are generally supportive and complementary. These ESY programs evidently were economical, resulted in equal or improved student performance and were acceptable to students, teachers and parents alike. Yet by 1940 all districts had reverted to a nine month standard schedule for all students. If the present interest in ESY is to be more than just another educational fad which will have its day and pass, the question of why these earlier experiments failed -- and fail they did -- must be addressed and satisfactorily answered. The problem seems to have been one of the disruption of community and family life style, particularly as it affected vacation patterns but neither the problem nor the answers are clear from the available literature.

Another seldom discussed aspect of ESY programs is its relationship to the changing attitudes of society toward women's rights and the working mother, and the increased demand for pre-kindergarten educational opportunities and government provided or supported day-care centers for young children. A school system which has its buildings open and operating forty-eight weeks per year is going to face pressures to accept children for forty-eight weeks rather than an arbitrarily selected thirty-six. The desirability of school as the agent to operate pre-kindergarten facilities will increase with year round operation and, to the extent that this need is met, increased not decreased costs will result.

One final point should be made at this stage of our discussion. A number of the arguments that one finds in the ESY literature are predicated on the teacher shortage which existed from the early 1950's until 1968 or 1969. The past two years have been witness to a dramatic reversal in the teacher supply-demand equation. The question of whether employing a smaller number of teachers for a longer period of time is to be preferred to a larger number employed for the traditional nine or ten months can no longer be answered solely by the argument that it will upgrade the quality of teaching and the professional status of teachers. Good quality, well-trained teachers are available and the issue of what ESY does to the job market is an issue that teachers and teacher organizations must face.

The previous pages have outlined a number of major issues which should be recognized in any serious consideration of ESY. The list has been generated by what we have seen as major deficiencies in both the professional literature and the local feasibility studies that we have examined and is not meant to be exhaustive. The historical review which follows will suggest additional issues.

HISTORICAL OVERVIEW

Between the years 1900 and 1940 approximately twenty[1] of this nation's local school districts experimented with some form of extended or year-round school operation. At least one of these experiments lasted nineteen years and several others nearly ten years. Examination of the reports describing and evaluating these efforts reveals striking similarities to the ESY literatures of the past five years. The rationale for extended school operation four decades ago uses all of the arguments found today. The format of these early ESY plans included all present day ideas except the multiple vacation, staggered attendance plan, e.g., the 45-15 plan or variations thereof. In general, reports of ongoing programs are supportive of the idea of year-round school operation -- some money was saved, students seemed to learn as much, teachers adapted to the revised schedules and communities apparently went along with the ESY operation. Yet, by 1940, all of the efforts at ESY operations had ceased to exist.

In the belief that the past does have lessons for the present, the following brief historical overview is presented. The answer to the really important question of what went wrong is difficult to ferret out. Birth notices for new ideas are easy to find in the educational literature but obituaries are seldom found. This is particularly true of the early ESY literature.

Before beginning a discussion of some of the more notable attempts at year-round school operation, it might be well to make a few comments about the origins of our present nine month or 180 day school calendar. The idea that this is a direct result of the largely agricultural orientation of our economy is only partially true.

In the mid-1800's two distinct patterns of school operations existed (See Reals, 1928). In rural areas school years were often as short as 100 days with fall and spring terms separated by a lengthy winter break as well as the four month summer break. We call it a break rather than vacation because, for many youngsters, the non-school periods were ones of hard physical labor rather than prolonged play periods. The major urban areas, on the other hand, were operating their schools 240 or more days per year, usually dividing the year into four quarters of approximately 12 weeks separated by a week vacation. School attendance was far from universal and considerable flexibility in attendance was tolerated. One must remember that a century ago child labor was still an important element of our industrial work force and schools were organized to fit the economic realities of the times.

During the latter years of the nineteenth and the early years of the present century a combination of factors modified both of these extreme positions and, by 1915, the school year was generally defined as between 140 and 200 days (Reals, 1928). The factors leading to this compromise position included changing attitudes toward child labor, increased statewide regulation of education, continued population growth, expanding industrialization and the need to Americanize hundreds of thousands of children of foreign born parents.

---

[1] Those to which specific references have been found are listed in Table 2. Undoubtedly some other experiments were attempted without getting into the literature.

TABLE 2. Summary of pre-World War II Experimentation with ESY

Location	Dates of Operation	Type of Plan	Mandatory or Voluntary	Schools and Pupils Involved	Primary Purpose
Bluffton, Ind.	1904-15	Staggered quarter	Voluntary	Approximately 50% of common school pupils	Increased education opportunity
Newark, N.J.	1912-31	Lengthened year	Voluntary	10 buildings and approximately 13,000 pupils	Compensatory education for ghetto, foreign born students
Minot, N.D.	1914-21 (or longer)	Lengthened year	Voluntary	About 70% of pupils	Campus school experiment
Nashville, Tenn.	1924-28	Staggered quarter	Voluntary	Entire system (41 bldgs.) and over 50% of students (11 - 15 thousand)	Not determined; perhaps year-round employment of teachers
Omaha, Neb.		Staggered quarter	Voluntary	1 high school with about 4000 students	Economy and increased educational opportunity
Aliquippa, Pa.	1928-38	Staggered quarter	Mandatory	Entire system (10 schools and over 7200 pupils)	Economy and increased space
Ambridge, Pa.	1932-38	Staggered quarter	Mandatory	Jr. and Sr. High School with 2100 pupils	Economy and increased space
Albuquerque, N.M. Amarillo, Texas Ardmore, Oklahoma Eveleth, Minn. Gary, Indiana Marion City, Iowa Tulla, Oklahoma	Hebb, 1923, simply lists these schools as having all-year calendars.				

Bluffton, Indiana

The earliest record of year-round operation as an alternative to the nine months of school, three of vacation, schedule was in Bluffton, Indiana, a small community 20 miles south of Fort Wayne. Bluffton operated on an optional staggered quarter or 180-60 plan for eleven years between 1904 and 1915. The only first-hand report is an article by the Superintendent, W. A. Wirt (1907). Wirt argued that the plan should be defended on the basis of providing greater service rather than economy. He lists the following specific advantages: 1) Children forced to be absent for long periods of time can more easily catch up to their peers, 2) Older children can often find jobs during the spring and fall quarters, 3) Schools are healthier places during the summer months than during the winter, 4) Space is released, and 5) Instruction costs do not increase. Wirt sounds particularly modern when he hints at the need for individualization of instruction by stating that the four quarter plan tends to "break up the rigid school machinery whereby all pupils are held together in a 'lock step', marking time . . . regardless of their varying conditions and ability." No data is presented to substantiate the claims of success made by Superintendent Wirt.

Newark, New Jersey

Newark, New Jersey, experimented with an extended school year schedule in a cluster of center city schools during the years 1912-1931. Initially instituted in two elementary buildings, one each in the Jewish and Italian sections of the city, the plan eventually included eight elementary schools, one K-9 building and the Central Commercial and Manual Training High School. Corson (1918) reported over 8500 children in seven schools in the year-round program during the summer of 1918. Lovell (1927) states that approximately 3300 students were involved in the Central High School program in 1924. Roe (1931) states that 8709 pupils in grades 1-8 were attending year-round schools in the summer of 1930 compared to 17,821 who were enrolled in regular summer school or playground programs.

The school year (Lovell, 1927) was 48 weeks long[1] with a week vacation at Christmas and Easter and two additional weeks late in August. The 48 weeks were divided into four terms of 12 weeks with three terms being the equivalent of two semesters in the other Newark schools. Since the standard school year was approximately 195 days long, this equivalence was justified by extending the length of high school class periods from 45 to 50 minutes. At the elementary level the school day was increased from 5 1/4 hours to 6 (Corson, 1918). While attendance during the summer was voluntary, Corson (1918) reports 74% summer enrollment in 1918 and Row (1931) reports an average summer enrollment during the years 1921-1923 of over 9700 or nearly 83% of the September through May attendance. These percentages are based on the enrollments of year-round schools only.

While a stated purpose of the plan was to accelerate students through eight grades of elementary school in six years, the real motivation seems to have been

---

[1] Brinkerhoff (1931b), five years later, states that the all-year schools operated 230 days or 38 weeks per year, indicating some modification of the schedule over time.

a concern for providing a type of compensatory education to children of foreign born immigrants living in the Newark ghettos. Brinkerhoff (1930) states:

> "It is doubtful that the founders of the all-year plan really meant that they expected the rank and file of pupils to complete the elementary school course in six years; for they deliberately placed the all-year schools in congested districts, where pupils were handicapped socially, mentally, and linguistically. Also, they knew that children as a whole in the ten-month schools were not completing the eight-year course in eight years and that many average pupils were leaving before graduation."

The Newark experience is well documented in a series of articles spanning the period from 1918 to 1931. (Corson, 1918; Farrand and O'Shea, 1925, 1926; Lovell 1927; Brinkerhoff, 1930, 1931a, 1931b; Roe, 1926, 1931). Corson was Superintendent of Schools, Brinkerhoff and Roe were building principals in year-round elementary schools, Farrand and O'Shea were outside consultants brought in to study and make recommendations concerning the ESY operation and Lovell was a teacher in Newark Central Commercial High School.

In 1925, based upon recommendations by Superintendent Corson, the Newark Board of Education voted to abandon the all-year schools on September 1, 1925. The basis for this decision were the arguments that the schools were not accelerating students through eight grades in six years, that the administrative problems of two types of schools in one system were practically insurmountable and that the cost of the all-year schools was so excessive that their abandonment was imperative (Farrand and O'Shea, 1926). Considerable opposition to the decision forced the Board to reconsider and in June, 1925 they commissioned Farrand and O'Shea to evaluate the success of the all-year schools.

The 1925 Farrand and O'Shea reference, a report to the Newark Board of Education which we have not been able to obtain, was a lengthy, comprehensive document (over 100 pages) based upon considerable data dealing with achievement and promotion information on students, a comparative survey of economic, hygienic, racial, social and lingual conditions which set students in year-round schools apart from their peers in ten month schools. The 1926 Farrand and O'Shea reference, a published summary of their 1925 Newark Board of Education report, does list their major recommendations:

> "We find that while they [the year-round schools] do not do what was originally claimed for them, that is, carry any considerable number of their pupils through eight grades in six years, they do advance their pupils and give them greater educational attainment than pupils of similar ability, heredity and social background in the traditional [ten-month] schools . . . the all year schools are holding and carrying through a class of pupils who in the regular schools would be likely to drop out or to be seriously retarded. We find that these schools in the face of great difficulties, are doing extremely valuable work and are rendering great service, particularly to children of

foreign parentage and unfavorable home conditions, and that these children will suffer educationally if the all-year schools are abolished. We find that the additional cost[1] is not excessive considering the service rendered.

"We recommend, in view of all the evidence, that the all-year schools in Newark be continued and that they be given every facility to make their work more efficient than it has been thus far." (Farrand and O'Shea, 1926).

In a series of four articles appearing five years later, Brinkerhoff (1930, 1931a, 1931b) and Roe (1931) examined the effect of the all-year schools of Newark upon pupil advancement, scholarship and social adjustment and compared costs of all-year to ten-month plus summer school type operation. On all counts they concluded that the all-year school had positive results and was cost effective, thereby, leading to the conclusion that the all-year school organization should be retained. While the rationale for their support of the all-year school is well presented and supported by data, much of the data pre-dates the 1925 Wilson and O'Shea report and, thus, adds little to the recommendations quoted above. In 1931, apparently due to the national economic situation rather than for education reasons, the all-year program was abandoned.

Nashville, Tennessee

Another major experiment with year-round operation began in Nashville, Tennessee on June 23, 1924 (George Peabody College, 1931a). This experiment, a city-wide voluntary four-quarter plan, lasted until 1932. Summer term attendance averaged slightly over 50% during the years of the plan with between 40 and 50% of the white pupils and between 60 and 70% of the black students participating. During the years, 1924-1930, the summer term enrollments were all between 11 and 15 thousand.

H. C. Weber, Nashville Superintendent of Schools, (in George Peabody College, 1931a) lists seventeen advantages of the summer quarter including such items as gaining advanced standing, the advantages of school buildings over homes in hot summer weather, and not cultivating habits of indolence due to the three month vacation period. Justifications for the all-year program that do not appear on Superintendent Weber's list include the creation of more space for a system that had all its first and second grade pupils on double shifts, and an approach to increasing salaries for teachers who were being paid less than 60% of what teachers in comparable positions in other cities of equal size were receiving (George Peabody College, 1931b).

During 1930 the George Peabody College for Teachers, Division of Surveys and Field Studies undertook two extensive studies of the Nashville schools at the request of the Nashville Board of Education. One was an extensive look at the year-round program (1931a) and the other an in-depth examination of the entire school system (1931b). To appropriately set the scene we quote from the latter document:

---

[1] The additional cost came to $150,000 in a total annual budget of more than $9,000,000.

"Whatever the procedure or technique employed, whether in studying the elementary schools, the junior or senior high schools, the training and salaries of teachers, school buildings, or organization, administration and finance, the outcomes and final conclusions, with minor exceptions, have always been the same. In general, the public schools of Nashville are poor and in certain respects very poor."

Data in this same report emphasizes the magnitude of the problem: over 50% of the teaching staff in the white elementary schools had less than one year of post-high school preparation for their teaching job; approximately 1/6 of all elementary school work and 1/4 of secondary school work resulted in student failure; of 45 school buildings, none was rated good, 19 were rated fair, 11 unsatisfactory, and 15 unusable. Staff, instructional program and physical facilities all needed major upgrading. It was in this setting that the Nashville all-year school existed and, apparently, failed.

We summarize the Nashville experience with all-year education with selected conslusions from the first Peabody report (1931a):

"The data presented in this study . . . of the all-year school of Nashville challenge, if they do not refute, the basic assumption of the advocates of the all-year school, viz., that children in large numbers can do as good school work during four quarters per year as they can do during three quarters . . . . . Elementary pupils, at least, who have attended the summer quarter in Nashville do not do proportionately as well as children who do not attend summer school. . . . a summer term, run as an integral part of an all-year school which not only encourages all children to attend, but enrolls all who wish to attend, will find no justification for its practice and procedure in the data of this study . . . the data of this study indicate that a summer quarter, as an integral part of an all-year school, can serve to advantage a highly selected group of children only and that its doors cannot justifiably be thrown open to all children who may for one reason or another present themselves for enrollment.

" . . . this increase in educational opportunities and in pupil instruction days [resulting from the summer quarter] was achieved in part by shortening the regular school year and by lessening the educational opportunities of children during the regular quarter, -- was achieved in part by robbing Peter and paying Paul.

"Nor does the data of this study give comfort to the advocates of the all-year school as an economy measure. . . . the summer quarter as an integral part of the all-year school has thus far in no way affected either the building or teacher requirements for the regular quarter. [Fewer than 3% of those attending the summer quarter elected to take vacations during other quarters.]

" . . . the summer quarter . . . has unquestionably served the social and physical needs of Nashville children during the summer months as they have never been served before. It has at least taken . . . thousands of Nashville children out of backyards and off the streets. . .

"The question at issue is and the data of this study seem to provide an affirmative answer: Would it not have been better for Nashville to have followed the example of cities of corresponding size, lengthened instead of shortened the regular school year, and then exerted every effort to develop a summer school more nearly adapted to the summer needs of all city children?"

Aliquippa and Ambridge, Pennsylvania

In July, 1928, the Aliquippa[1], Pennsylvania, Public Schools (Vanderslice, 1930) began operating three of its schools with nearly 2000 pupils on a compulsory staggered quarter plan. By October, 1930, the system's ten schools with over 7200 pupils was on the all-year plan. Two years later the neighboring district of Ambridge, Pennsylvania went to the all-year plan for students in grades 5 through 12 (Irons, 1934). Of all the pre-World War II experiments with twelve month schools these two receive the most attention by present day writers. This is undoubtedly true because these are the two situations in which the clearly stated goal was to save money by avoiding building expansion and in which vacations during other than the summer months were made mandatory.

Vanderslice (1933) reports that in the 5-year period from 1928-1933 Aliquippa postponed the building of 37 classrooms, saved $201,877 which represented two mills on the tax levy, found that attendance was slightly higher during the two spring-summer-early fall quarters and that pupil academic progress is not impaired by summer attendance. Wilson (School Management, 1957), a building principal who later succeeded Vanderslice as Superintendent, is quoted as saying that "The [physical] growth of pupils in the all-year school exceeded the growth during the nine-month schools!" No details are presented as to how this conclusion was reached.

Irons, (1934) in reporting on the Ambridge experiment, presents similar results. There were no apparent negative effects on student's health. Overall attendance was increased in year-round operation and illegal absence reduced considerably. Fifty-four of 68 teachers judged the plan an educational success. Some financial savings were realized but the exact amount of savings is not clear from Irons' article. No significant differences were noted in student achievement between the nine-month and year-round systems. Finally, vacation assignments did prove to be a troublesome aspect of the plan.

---

[1] Aliquippa is an Ohio River town located north of Pittsburg on the Ohio-Pennsylvania border. Ambridge is a few miles to the east.

Regarding one of the financial aspects, we quote Irons (1934) on the matter of teacher pay:

> "The salary adjustment for each of [the 33 of 65 teachers who were placed on 12 month contracts], with the exception of six who were quite highly paid, amounted to an increase in annual salary. The increase was not prorated. For example, a high-school teacher who received $1800 on the nine-month basis, did not receive $2400 for the twelve months. The theory operating here was that the $1800 covered the living expenses for the year. The salary for twelve months was $2160. If it could have been possible to place just the teachers needed on a twelve-months schedule, considerable savings would have been possible. The actual change made in total teacher salary in the junior and vocational high schools [the only ones on year-round operation] was a slight increase in the payroll."

The underlining is ours. Six teachers received no increase in pay for the extra assignment while the remainder received a 20% increase for 33 1/3% more teaching. Yet the total payroll went up. No further explanation or comment is provided by Irons. We suggest that this apparent contradiction is a function of the practical difficulties in scheduling smaller, staggered groups of children which often, if not inevitably, lead to decreased efficiency in the assignment of teaching personnel.

Both Aliquippa and Ambridge discontinued year-round operation in 1938. Hartsell (1953) quotes correspondence with the Superintendents of both school systems concerning their experience. Aliquippa Superintendent L. M. Wilson summarized as follows:

> "We will not return to the year-round plan except in an emergency because we feel that the disadvantages of the plan growing out of our experience with it outweigh the advantages to such an extent that we would not be justified in considering it again.
>
> Advantages:
> 1. Relieve the building program
> 2. Buildings were used continuously
> 3. Gave some opportunity for acceleration (A questionable advantage)
> 4. Failing pupils could repeat a quarter's work during their regular vacation period if they wished.
>
> Disadvantages:
> 1. Maintenance and repair of building very difficult and almost impossible without interference with school work.
> 2. Objections on part of parents to vacation periods other than during the summer months.
> 3. Constant changing of classroom groups and teachers due to permitting teachers to take their choice of vacation periods.
> 4. A let-down in work during the summer session by both teachers and pupils."

Superintendent N. A. Smith evaluated Ambridge's all-year program by stating "The plan was extremely difficult to administer, unpopular with the patrons, and discontinued as soon as a new building was completed."

Hebb (1923) and Reals (1928) identify 12 additional districts that operated year-round schools during the 1920's. These districts were: Gary, Indiana; Mason City, Iowa; Eveleth, Minnesota; Omaha, Nebraska; Bayonne, New Jersey; Albuquerque, New Mexico; Minot, North Dakota; Ardmore and Tulsa, Oklahoma; Chatanooga, Tennessee and Amarillo and El Paso, Texas. The only two described in the literature, Omaha's Technical High School (Beveridge, 1925) and the Minot Normal School's campus school (Clarke, 1921) are one building operations with special student populations. The articles are basically descriptions of how the schools operated and give no data evaluating the educational experiences.

Newark, Nashville, Aliquippa and Ambridge present forty-three years of experience with three major variations of ESY, a lengthened school year, voluntary four quarter and mandatory four-quarter, staggered vacation plans. All were run on a substantial scale with at least seven thousand students involved in each. The evidence suggest that the Newark plan, while costing more, was an educational success. The Nashville plan in part operated as a lengthened school year plan because practically no one chose to vacation during the September to May period. It, however, was neither an educational nor economic success although this may be a function of the difficulties that plagued all aspects of the system rather than the concept of year-round schools. The Aliquippa and Ambridge experiments appeared to have saved small amounts of money at little or no educational cost, yet, with the advantage of fifteen years hindsight, both Superintendents stated that they would return to year-round operation only in an emergency. None of these districts, in fact, none of the districts mentioned as having year-round operation in the 20's and 30's is known to have returned to that type of operation.

There can be little doubt that the past forty years have witnessed substantial changes both in educational practice and in the larger society. Whether the changes have been so considerable as to render these earlier experiences irrelevant to todays' schools and their problems is another issue. While we believe not, we recognize that it is a moot point. We suggest that anyone seriously considering ESY as a viable alternative consider the questions, "Why is it that Newark (or Nashville or Aliquippa, etc.) never returned to all-year operation of their schools?", "How is our community and our rationale for considering ESY different from these earlier attempts?" and "How do we propose to avoid the problems these districts apparently had?"

Little ESY activity took place during the two decades from 1940 to 1960. The reduced birth rates of the depression and war years took some of the space pressures off schools until the early 1950's. When the effects of the post-World War II population explosion began to crowd schools in the mid-fifties, school districts found the public generally receptive to building programs. Where resistance to building programs was met, the typical solution was some form of double-shifting rather than ESY operation. While one can only surmise at the reasons, the generally temporary connotation of double-shifting as opposed to the relative permanency of year-round approaches undoubtedly has some influence on school administrators.

Another development of this period was a considerable interest in and expansion of summer sessions for more than the making up of academic deficiencies or remedial work. Regular academic courses were offered as well as enrichment type courses put together solely as part of the summer session offerings. Again, the reasons are many and complex, including increased mechanization of home chores, growing suburban residential areas with decreased employment opportunities for teen-agers, and pressure from school faculties for more year-round employment opportunities.

Both the double-shift and expanded summer sessions approaches, while not specifically a part of ESY, do represent substantial attempts to get more educational mileage from existing school facilities and thus helped keep the ESY issue alive.

Most of the literature of this period are short statements, almost editorial in nature, raising the question of whether it doesn't make sense to get more use out of school facilities by year-round operation. Many of these articles seem ignorant of the earlier experimentation with twelve month operation and have little to offer in the way of specific recommendations as to how ESY could be operationalized.

As the full impact of the post-World War II population boom began to be felt by school systems during the middle and late 1950's, a number of major school systems revived the idea of ESY and conducted studies of its feasibility. Among these cities were Los Angeles, Atlanta and Cincinnati. Smaller systems that explored the possibilities of year-round operation were Fairfield, Connecticut and Redwood City, California. A report on the Atlanta study (School Management, 1957) was headlined "NO! SAYS ATLANTA . . . it's cheaper to build." Although the Fairfield study (School Management, 1957) projected a tax savings of $3.30 a year per $1000 of assessed evaluation by four-quarter operation, the plan was rejected due to parental objections. The Los Angeles report (Sequoia High School District, 1960) compared potential savings of several million dollars due to a reduced building program to added costs of at least $2.9 million in the areas of transportation, plant maintenance and non-instructional salaries. None of the communities actually implemented any type of year-round operation.

The Redwood City report (Sequoia High School District, 1960), written at the culmination of two and one-half years study by a twenty-six member citizen committee, is an excellent model of what a local feasibility study should include[1]. While no specific preference is indicated among the four plans studied -- the traditional mode of operation, the four-quarter plan, double sessions and a split-day-extended-school-year plan -- it does offer an excellent analysis of the pros and cons of each. Of interest is that this report contains the earliest precursors of the "45-15" approach that we have identified. The plans, evidently the invention of three of the committee members, call for a 90:30 or 60:20 (this report, page 6) type of calendar.

---

[1] The California Association of School Administrators reprinted the report as a significant contribution to the literature on the problem of physical plant utilization.

Another interesting innovation is split-day-extended-school-year calendar mentioned above. Among major problems with the traditional double-sessions approach are the shortening of the instructional day and the extremely early starting times for the first shift and the late dismissal hour for the second. The split-day-extended-school-year plan suggests keeping the school day within reasonable time limits and making up the lost instructional time by adding 35 to 40 days to the school year.

None of these feasibility studies of the 1950's resulted in the implementation of year-round programs although the studies undoubtedly had impact upon the expansion of summer session offerings and helped to keep the concept alive. In the Altanta situation the kernel of an idea was slanted which led to implementation of the Atlanta 4-quarter plan a decade later.

The 1960's proved to be a veritable caldron of political, economic and social ferment. This caldron repeatedly boiled over into the educational realm and led to unprecedented dissatisfaction with the job being done by schools and to the educational system becoming a focal point in the public revolt over the tax situation. The result has been a public climate in the past two or three years conducive to a major revival of the year-round or ESY concept, a climate which the exponents of year-round education have exploited.

The contributors to the ferment of the 1960's are multiple, complex, interrelated and often difficult to pin-point specifically. We call attention to some of the major aspects to give perspective to the last decade of development in the ESY arena.

During the decade of the 1960's the post-World War II population boom hit the expensive levels of our educational system, the secondary schools and colleges. Simultaneously, the wage-earners and taxpayers of the country comprised as small a fraction of the total population as they have at any time during the past century. Continued economic prosperity, fueled by high federal expenditures for the Viet Nam war and the space program, was dampened toward the end of the decade by steadily increasing rates of inflation and economic problems caused by reductions in military and space spending. The nation's economic difficulties accentuated the unemployment and welfare problem with resulting increased competition for major portions of the tax dollar.

A growing trend toward automation began to revolutionize our concept of work. The idea of 4-day or 35-hour work weeks were introduced. While number of production jobs decreased, the demand in the service occupations grew. Labor negotiations led to longer vacations and increased flexibility in vacation policies. Leisure time and recreational activity increased as well as changed in nature.

Changes also took place in education. The concepts of cost effectiveness, management by objectives, etc. moved from industry to the federal bureaucracy and ultimately into the educational enterprise. Big business diversified into

education. Concepts such as evaluation and accountability took their place in the educator's lexicon. Teaching machines, programmed learning, computer assisted instruction and behavioral objectives all contributed to a growing emphasis upon individualized learning.

Along a different tack, teachers organized, demanded and received the right to bargain collectively and insisted upon a larger role in policy determination. At the same time, students individually and collectively began to raise their voices concerning their dissatisfaction with society in general as well as with the educational system. Larger societal problems of race, drugs, the war, environmental deterioration focussed public attention on the schools because that is where the younger side of the generation gap was concentrated.

All of these factors and, undoubtedly, many left unsaid have contributed to a feeling of dissatisfaction with school systems as presently operated. When one combines this dissatisfaction with the extreme vulnerability of local school districts as scapegoat for a tax-weary public, one has a situation in which ESY is attractive as a potential panacea for both economic and educational discontent. This has been the situation during the past two or three years. While ESY is definitely not a panacea for the multitude of problems spawned by the conditions listed on the past few pages, it may well make good educational and social sense as our society becomes more urbanized, with all of the complexities that this entails.

In 1963 the New York State legislature issued a mandate to the state Department of Education to " . . . design demonstration programs and conduct experimentation to discuss the educational, social and other impacts of rescheduling the school year from the present thirteen year system to a twelve or eleven year system while still providing as many instructional hours ar more than are now available under the present thirteen year system." (New York Department of Education, 1965). This job was given to George I. Thomas, a research consultant in the Department's Office of Research and Evaluation. Between 1964 and 1970 Thomas generated nine documents totaling 571 pages dedicated to exploring and selling the ESY concept.

This series of documents are largely a catalog of possible calendars (see Table 3) that school districts could adopt to implement the ESY idea. The emphasis in all of Thomas' work is upon extending the days of school per pupil rather than maximizing facility use through rotational procedures. He argues that the world is a far more complex place than formerly and therefore children could profit from additional days of school per year. Furthermore, if the activities of these extra days are appropriately planned, students who so choose may accelerate and complete grades 1-12 in eleven or ten years. To the extent that large numbers of students would choose to graduate from high school one or two years early, the school system's total enrollment would decrease and proportionate economies be affected. His later writings tend to play down the early graduation and economic arguments and to emphasize the argument that today's children need more school.

TABLE 3. Approaches to Extending the School Year Listed in The Impact of a Rescheduled School Year, New York Department of Education, 1970

General Approach and Specific Plan	Description
I. Student Acceleration Approaches	(based upon the idea of working through grades 1 - 12 in 10 or 11 years and thus graduating early)
A. Acceleration Trimester	3 70-day terms; all students attend 210 days/year
B. Split Trimester	3rd trimester split into 2 terms; only one split term required or 175 days/year
C. Acceleration Quadrimester	4 52 to 55 day terms with lengthened days so 3 quadrimester = 2 semesters
D. Acceleration Split-Quadrimester	4th term split with only 1 split term required; 132 to 192 days/year
E. Continuous Progress	210 day year with no terms and no grade levels; student proceeds through curriculum at his own rate
F. Extended Summer Segment	Traditional summer school emphasizing regular courses rather than remedial or enrichment work
G. Extended K-12 Acceleration	Similar to Continuous Progress but retaining the grade level identification
II. Term Rotation Approaches	(based upon concept of having some children on vacation during all months of the year)
A. Staggered quarter	The Aliquippa and Ambridge plan with assigned vacation quarter
B. Four quarter	Same as above but with vacation quarter chosen by student
C. Non-acceleration Trimester	Lengthened day permits 2 trimesters to equal 2 semesters. Student attends 2 of 3 trimesters or approximately 160 days
D. Twelve-Four Term Rotation	The 60-20 plan as described above on pages 3-4
E. 45-15	As described on pages 3-4
F. Nine-three	A 45-15 plan with 3rd week of every vacation used for remedial work with student who need it
G. Flexible All-year School	Student attends minimum of 180 days of 240, choosing when to be in school and when to vacation
III. Multiple Trails Approach	A flexible-modular scheduling type approach combined with considerable individualization of instruction. School open for 42 weeks and students attend all weeks but not all days of every week.
IV. Summer School Approach	Encompasses all plans for summer use of schools traditionally followed

While the legislative mandate to the N.Y. Department of Education clearly called for demonstration programs and experimentation relatively little was done along these lines. Thomas' work is almost completely theoretical and since he makes no references it is difficult to trace the antecedents for his ideas.

A second important source of support for the ESY concept during the 1960's was the National School Calendar Study Committee (NSCSC) organized and headed by George Jensen, a retired engineer and former Minneapolis school board member, who has made advocacy of ESY his major avocation. While the NSCSC is described as a citizen's committee, Jensen is the only member we have found named in connection with the organization. The NSCSC has generated no material of its own except for a number of short exhortative articles by Jensen which offer no data and little practical advice on the how of implementing an ESY program. The organization does maintain a collection of clippings on year-round operations taken from newspapers and the popular magazines.[1] These clippings typically are variations on the analogy between capital equipment use in business and industry and its use by educational institutions.

Probably the most important ESY developments of the past decade have been the decisions of the Atlanta metropolitan area schools to go to a four-quarter mode of operation and the Valley View, Illinois, school district to implement a 45-15 plan. While the latter has created the most excitement and interest, the Atlanta approach has been much more carefully planned and organized, and may have more of substance to offer than the Valley View experience.

Atlanta, Georgia

In 1967 the eight school districts[2] comprising the metropolitan Atlanta area joined together to cooperatively search for the solutions to certain common problems. In contrast to the experience of 1957, when the motivation had been reduction of school costs, the "overriding purpose was to provide relevant and flexible educational opportunities. Flexibility with the pupils' educational opportunities as the main focal point was accepted as the basis for selecting another organizational structure to support the philosophy and educational goals of the Atlanta School System. The four-quarter plan of operation was selected as the vehicle through which this major curriculum renovation could be realized." (Henson, 1970).

---

[1] SWREC's request for information was met with copies of a dozen or more newspaper and magazine clippings and a copy of the New York Department of Education publication, The Impact of a Rescheduled School Year, 1970.

[2] The city of Atlanta and the adjacent DeKalb and Fulton county areas have approximately 300,000 pupils in public schools.

The Atlanta plan divided the school year into four terms or quarters of 57 to 60 days each. Students are required to attend three of the four quarters and may attend all four if so desired. Currently the program exists at the high school level only although planning for ESY operation of the elementary schools is taking place. The first quarter of year-round operation began in September, 1968 and presently is in its fourth year of operation. More extensive descriptions of the program are available (particularly Henson, 1970) and our purpose is merely to emphasize some unique features of the Atlanta experience.

The major distinguishing feature of the Atlanta plan is the emphasis upon enhanced educational opportunities as the purpose for extending the school year. Participation in the year-round or summer aspects of the program is voluntary[1] which will probably guarantee that the program will not result in financial savings. Probably the most impressive characteristic of the Atlanta plan is the vast amount of planning resources that went into getting ready to implement the quarter plan. Two year of planning and curriculum revision preceded the 1968 starting date. The entire high school curriculum was rewritten into over eight hundred separate quarter courses. Since flexibility was a major principle followed, emphasis was placed upon minimizing prerequisites and the sequencing of courses. Probably no attempt at year-round school operation has been preceded by as much careful planning, particularly in the curriculum area.

Valley View 45-15

In the spring of 1968 the Illinois legislature voted to make kindergartens compulsory in all schools of the state. For Valley View School District 96, a blue collar residential suburban area 30 miles southwest of Chicago's Loop, this was the proverbial straw that broke the camel's back. Steady growth of the area had resulted in school enrollments going from 89 students in 1953 to 6950 in 1970 (Hermanson and Gove, 1971). By the late 1960 s this growth rate was approximately 600 students per year. When the need to house 1320 kindergarten students was added to the existing problems it became obvious that drastic action was required to solve the problem. The proposed solutions were double sessions, increasing class size to approximately 40 or some form of staggered instruction-vacation cycle ESY. The result was the development during the late summer of 1968 of the Valley View 45-15 plan.

The Valley View plan has children attending school for four 45-day instructional segments per year for a total of 180 days. These instructional periods are separated

---

[1] Summer attendance during the first summer quarter was approximately 79% of the average fall, winter, spring attendance. This is somewhat inflated as this included anyone taking 1 or more courses. The cost for the first summer quarter is estimated to have cost $1.7 million (Henson, 1970). For comparison purposes, the traditional summer schools in Atlanta had enrolled 25% of the high school population.

by 15-day vacations. The student body is placed into four tracks, each of which takes their vacations during different three week periods. Thus, three tracks or groups of students are in school during any three week period while the fourth group is on vacation. The effect is to increase the theoretical capacity of the district's school buildings by 33 1/3%.

For many, 45-15 has become synonomous with ESY. Due in part to the dramatic appeal of increasing building capacity by 33 1/3% while solving the prolonged winter vacation problem, the plan has created a new wave of enthusiasm for ESY in this area of the country. The enthusiasm may or may not be warranted. An obvious attraction of the 45-15 plan is the promised economic benefit. Yet, as this is written, there is no good summary of the budgetary effects of the first year of 45-15 operation, the 1970-71 school year. Data contained in a book (Hermansen and Gove) and two lengthy federal government reports (Gove and Page, 1970 and Rogge, 1971) raises as many questions as are answered. Gove and Page and Rogge provide two budget figures for the 1969-70 school year which differ by $1,437,301.[1] Hermanson and Gove (P.114) say information about actual dollar savings must await the 1970-71 audit to be completed in September, 1971. As of May, 1972 we have not been able to find that data. Savings of 5% were projected by Rogge but these are based on increasing enrollment a full third by 45-15 and by using rather crude budget projections.

Additional questions must be raised about the effect of 45-15 on children. Over 61% of Valley View teachers elected to work more than the standard 184 days during 1970-71.. For a teacher to teach more days than any one cohort of students attends school, that teacher must pick up a new class of students coming off vacation every 45 days. Thus, a majority of children in Valley View are facing a new teacher every nine weeks. The question of what happens to children under these circumstances is one which the Valley View people do not answer. Any serious consideration of 45-15 dictates that it must be answered.

A number of additional districts implemented a 45-15 plan of operation during the 1971-72 school year. Data on the operation of these plans are not available at this time. As more data on Valley View and other 45-15 operations become available we hope to be able to rewrite this section.

Year-Round Education Seminars

In 1968 a number of individuals interested in year-round school organized a National Seminar on Year-Round Education which met in Fayetteville,Arkansas in early 1969. This proved to be the first in a series of annual meetings, the

---

[1] Gove and Page, 1970 (p. 81) say it was $5,955,901 and Rogge, 1971 (p. 29) says it was $4,518,600.

most recent of which was held in San Diego in late February 1972. At the San Diego meeting action was taken to formally organize a National Council on Year-Round Education. Dr. Wayne H. White[1], Superintendent of the Brevard County, Florida Schools was elected president.

Proceedings of the four seminars have been published and are available through the U.S.O.E.'s ERIC system. The documents are definitely biased toward ESY and are basically arguments for year-round school operation and theoretical papers on how or why ESY should work. The 1971 and 1972 documents contain some discription of various school districts experience with ESY but this is largely narrative and contains little or no data about the effects of ESY on either budgets or children.

Conclusion

Any attempt to write history while that history is taking place is bound to be an unsatisfactory undertaking. The past few pages have attempted to avoid that pitfall in describing the events of the past few years. We have attempted to direct the reader toward the action by sketching in some of the names, places, and organizations that are making educational history with year-round operation. While a number of districts nation-wide have moved to year-round operation during the past year and even more are contemplating it for the 1972-73 school year, we believe that the jury is still out; that it will take some hard data to demonstrate if, and how well, ESY can fulfill the promises made for it. Where our reading has led us to questions which appear unanswered or to data which is in conflict or to arguments based upon untenable assumptions, we have attempted to raise those issues. The intent has been neither to support nor oppose the concept of ESY but to clarify the issues and provide useful background information for individuals or groups interested in the potential of year-round school or ESY.

---

[1] Dr. White's address, for those interested in the organization, is Brevard County School District, 3205 Southe Washington Avenue, Titusville, FL 32780.

REFERENCES

Bauman, W. Scott, "The Flexible System: An Economic Analysis of Advantages of the Quarterly Calendar in Public School", A Publication of the Business Research Center College of Business Administration, the University of Toledo, Toledo, Ohio 1966, 40p.

Beveridge, J. H., "Omaha High Schools on All-Year Plan", School Life, XI, 2, October, 1925, p.22.

Brinkerhoff, George I., "The Effects of All-Year Schools Upon Pupil Advancement", Educational Method, December, 1930, 10, 168-174.

Brinkerhoff, George I., "The Effects of All-Year Schooling Upon Scholarships", Educational Method, 1931, 10, 203-209.

Brinkerhoff, George I., "The Effects of All-Year Schooling Upon Social Adjustment", Educational Method, 1931, 10, 290-294.

Clarke, W. F., "An All-Year Elementary School", Elementary School Journal, 1921, 22, 286-289.

Compact, "State Action -- Extending the School Year", Compact, 4, 6, 38-44, December, 1970.

Carson, David B., "The All-Year School", Journal of Education, 88:563-68, December 5, 1918.

Farrand, Wilson, and M. V. O Shea, The All Year Schools of Newark, New Jersey. Board of Educationa, Newark, NJ, 1925.

* Farrand, Wilson, and M. V, O Shea, "The All-Year Schools in Newark", School and Society, 23:462-69, April 10, 1926.

* George Peabody College for Teachers, Division of Surveys and Field Studies, The All-Year Schools of Nashville, Tennessee. Field Study, No. 3, Nashville: the College, 1931a 60p.

George Peabody, College for Teachers, "Public Schools of Nashville, Tennessee, A Survey Report", Division of Surveys and Field Studies, 1931b.

Hartsell, H.C., "The Twelve-Month School", Bulletin of the National Association of Secondary-School Principals, 37:18-33, December, 1953.

Hebb Bertha U., "All-Year Schools Have Many Advantages", School Life, VIII, 9, May, 1923, p. 198.

* Henson, E. Curtis, The Four-Quarter School Year in the Atlanta Public Schools. Atlanta Board of Education, Atlanta, January, 1970.

Hermansen, Kenneth E., and James R. Gove, The Year-Round School. Hamden, Conn. Shoe String Press, 1971, 178pp.

Irons, H. S., "Utilizing Buildings and Instructional Materials 12 Months Annually", American School Board Journal, March, 1934, p. 17-19.

Lovell, Louise F., "All-Year School", Education Review, 73:196-202, April, 1927.

National Education Association, Research Division, The Rescheduled School Year. Research Summary 1968-S2, Washington, D.C., NEA, 1968. 39pp.

* National School Public Relations Association, Year Round School, Education U.S.A. Report, Washington, D.C., 1971, 64pp.

National Seminar on Year-Round Education, Mt. Sequoyah. Arkansas School Study Council, Fayetteville, Fayetteville School District, Arkansas, 1969, 66pp.

National Seminar on Year-Round Education, Second. April 5, 6, 7, 1970. Sponsored by Pennsylvania Department of Education and Clarion State College.

National Seminar on Year-Round Education, Proceedings of 3rd. March 24-26, 1971. Cocoa Beach, Florida, with cooperating agencies: Florida Department of Education, Florida Technological University, and Brevard County School System.

* National Seminar on Year-Round Education, Proceedings of 4th. February 23-25, 1972. San Diego, California, sponsored by Superintendent of Schools, Department of Education, San Diego County, 100pp.

* New York State Education Department, "The Impact of a Rescheduled School Year. A Special Report Prepared for the Governor and the Legislature of the State of New York", N.Y. State Education Department, Albany, March, 1970, 164pp.

New York State Education Department, "A Preliminary Legislative Report on the Rescheduling of the School Year", N.Y. State Education Dept., Albany, February, 1965, 20pp.

New York State Education Department, "Setting the Stage for Lengthened School Year Programs -- A Special Report Prepared for the Governor and the Legislature of the State of New York", N.Y. State Education Department, Albany, March, 1968, 119pp.

Reals, Willis, H., A Study of the Summer High School. Contributions to Education No. 337, New York: Teachers College, Columbia University, 1928, 88pp.

Roe, Warren A., "The All-Year School", Bulletin, 6:10-22, October, 1926. Washington, D.C., Department of Elementary School Principals, National Education Association.

Roe, Warren A., "Comparative Costs of Integrated All-Year Schooling and of Part-Time Schooling", Educational Method, 1931, 10,350-358.

School Management, "The Twelve-Month School Year: Will It Solve Your Building Problems?" School Management, 1:22-25, 82-84, September, 1957.

* Sequoia Union High School District, "The Four-Quarter Plan and Other Methods of High School Plant Utilization", A Study by a Citizens' Committee of the Sequoia Union High School District, Redwood City, California, November, 1960, 105pp.

Tanner, J. M., "Earlier Maturation in Man", Scientific American, 218, 1:21-7, January, 1968.

Thomas, George I., Extended School Year Designs. Albany, University of the State of New York, State Education Department, Office of Research and Evaluation, August, 1965.

Thomas, George I., Setting the Stage for Lengthened School-Year Programs. Albany, University of the State of New York, State Education Department, March, 1968, 113pp.

Vanderslice, H. R., "The All-Year School in Aliquippa, Pennsylvania", Elementary School Journal, Vol. 30, April, 1930, 576-585, 9p.

Vanderslice, H. R., "Five Year's Experience With the All-Year Schools", Elementary School Journal, Vol. 34, December 1933, 256-268, 12pp.

White J. B., and Others, "Year-Round Schools for Polk County, Florida, A Feasibility Study", Florida Educational Research and Development Council, Gainesville, 1966, 75pp.

Wirt, W. A., "A School Year of Twelve Months", Education, June 1907, pp. 619-22.

---

* Those references preceded with an asterisk are suggested as in-depth examination of some of the ideas or narratives presented in this paper.